Editorial

Clearly, every mollusc family justifies, by its existence, a great interest on the part of professional malacologists, no matter if the shell is tiny, no matter if the color isn't very shimmering, no matter even if the mollusc has no shell at all !

Amateur malacologists, on the other hand, who choose their centers of interest more easily, will focus on such arguments as beauty, form, size and, unfortunately, even price sometimes (☹). Let's face it : some families, Cypraeidae or Conidae for example, are generally regarded as the elite whereas others (no names will be made !) are ignored or discarded. Needless to say, some shell shows are even articulated around this principle.

However, mentalities have been changing for some time. Indeed, you now read articles on nassariids, trochids, nucellids or littorinids, of course common, but with such a variability that it flatters both the aesthetic mind (shape or color variations) and the scientific mind (geographical variation, subspecies or even different species). Actually, these "minor" families are most interesting for those who try to study them, and are very often fertile in questions and topics research. Their systematics is sometimes extraordinarily complex, calling for a careful study of the shell and the anatomy. Those who will begin a serious study are certainly ready for hours of identification work as well for great ethologic and, let's not be afraid with this word, ecological discoveries. From this viewpoint, the difference between a littorine of the Asian mangroves and a littorine of Florida Keys is infinitely more enriching than a color difference between two cowries or two muricids.

After all, that's perhaps "biodiversity" applied to malacologists? Our wonder in face of all these forms of life whose logic and imbrications are still somewhat strange to us is probably the source of our incentive !

We are delighted to believe so again and again…

Claude Vilvens
Vice-President

Roland Houart
President